



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

MD

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/650,709	05/20/1996	DETLEF ALBIN	7693-002-0	2931

22850 7590 09/17/2003

OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
1940 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

DEXTER, CLARK F

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3724

DATE MAILED: 09/17/2003

~~43~~
59

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.
08/650,709

Applicant(s)
Albin et al.

Examiner
Clark F. Dexter

Art Unit
3724



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Jun 23, 2003
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2, 12, 13, 18, and 28-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) 2, 12, 13, 18, and 30 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 28 and 29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☒ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____ 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 3724

DETAILED ACTION

1. The amendment filed June 23, 2003 has been entered. It is noted that in view of the amendment practice under 37 CFR 1.121 which became effective for all amendments on March 1, 2001, and due to the limited amount of examining time per application, if the amendment contains changes to existing language that requires a marked-up version showing those changes, the Examiner is relying upon the marked-up version(s) for examination of the application. It is applicant's responsibility to ensure that the clean version(s) is (are) the same as the marked-up version(s). It is further noted that the clean version(s) is (are) considered to be the Official version(s).

Further, the Appeal Brief filed June 23, 2003 has been entered and considered. Due to the awkwardness of the claim language, further consideration of the claims in conjunction with applicant's arguments is necessary. Although applicant did not express the claimed invention in a manner that would be clear to one having ordinary skill in the art upon first studying the claims, it is now believed that applicant's intent as to what is the claimed invention is more clearly understood based on the claim language in conjunction with applicant's remarks (i.e., based on what the claim is intended to read, not what it actually reads) and thus further consideration of the claimed invention is necessary.

Art Unit: 3724

Claim Objections

2. Claims 28 and 29 are objected to because of the following informalities:

In claim 28, lines 8-10[✓] are unclear as to what is being set forth and it is requested that these lines are rewritten as follows:

--element and said back-up roll is situated below[,] and upstream [in] of a crown of the back-up roll with respect to a conveying direction of a layer of hydrous polymer gel to be cut at the nip, [with respect to a crown of the back-up roll,] whereby said at least one cutting edge cooperates with said back-up roll to cut the--.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Finke et al.,
pn 3,283,633.

Finke discloses a cutting device with every structural limitation of the claimed invention including a first cutting roll (e.g., 19) and a back-up roll (e.g., 21) as claimed.

Art Unit: 3724

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Finke et al., pn 3,283,633, taken alone or taken in view of Anderson et al., 2,735,488.

Finke discloses a cutting device with almost every structural limitation of the claimed invention but lacks the first cutting roll having at least one circumferentially extending cutting element including a cutting edge. However, the Examiner takes Official notice that such blade configurations, specifically an axially extending cutting blade and a circumferentially extending cutting blade on a cutting roll, are old and well known in the art and provide various known benefits, primarily facilitating both a cross cut and a longitudinal cut in a work piece to achieve a desired pattern. One example of such a blade is disclosed by Finke (e.g., on cutting roll 18). One other example is disclosed by Anderson et al. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one

Art Unit: 3724

having ordinary skill in the art to provide a circumferentially extending cutting element having a cutting edge on the cutting roll of Finke for the well known benefits including that described above.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 28 and 29 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment filed July 2, 2002 (paper no. 49) necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Art Unit: 3724

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.


9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Clark Dexter whose telephone number is (703) 308-1404. The examiner's typical work schedule is Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday, and he can be reached during normal business hours on these days.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Allan Shoap, can be reached at (703)308-1082.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703)308-1148. The fax numbers Technology Center 3700 are: after-final responses - (703)872-9303; other formal/official papers - (703)872-9302. The fax number for informal/draft papers - (703)305-9835.



Allan N. Shoap
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Group 3700



Clark F. Dexter
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3724

cf
September 10, 2003